

**COMMENT LETTER # 7**

SCOTT DRUMMOND

In regards to the Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Project

Questions are Submitted by:

Scott Drummond  
3792 Archwood Road  
Cameron Park, CA 95682  
916-804-1166

Questions:

Necessity

While you claim that the tribe and the tribes representatives will pay for the project and all "fair share" expenses, how can you justify allocating the resources of Cal-Trans to this project when there are several other projects that are more desperately needed to improve the road systems in El Dorado County?

1

Socio-Economics

5.9-2: Tourism

What is the single most significant component of the regional economy within a 10 mile radius of this proposed site? It is NOT tourism but local businesses for local residents. Thus wouldn't this business drastically change the fundamental characteristics of the surrounding neighborhoods?

2

5.5-4SUP: Cal-Trans Lacks Jurisdiction

You make reference to Alternative Casino plans D & E as being reduced project plans. Since you have stated in several locations in your EIR and supplemental EIR that you have no jurisdiction, how can you guarantee that the supposed tribe will not build a project that will impose a significant and drastic affect on the local neighborhoods socio-economically and environmentally? Such as double or triple the amount of traffic and environmental impacts and emissions then was reported in the EIR and supplemental.

3

5.9-3: 16 Homes on Rancheria.

5.5-4SUP: Rancheria is an indirect impact

How many current tax paying home owners or businesses have requested this project to be built in order to allow them access to their residence or business? From your own documents you have stated that all property owners, including the supposed tribe, have current and adequate access to their property without this project. Only 16 homes and 18 people will benefit from this project, Wouldn't this project seem to be a waste of resources and time while imposing a significant and drastic socio-economic travesty on all other local property owners?

4

5.9-4: Socioeconomics

Read section: 5.9-4

"Fundamentally change the character of a neighborhood."

Has Cal-Trans done any study about the socioeconomic changes and effect on public services such as police, fire, and other emergency services at the casino sites in Amador and Placer county?

5

Isn't this project the catalyst to allowing the building of a casino which will significantly, drastically and fundamentally change the character of both the two local neighborhoods as well as the overall community and surrounding townships.

6

Has Cal-Trans taken into consideration the facts that this project will be responsible for the economic hardships placed on the local residents and the surrounding townships?(surrounding areas 5.9-5)

7

## **COMMENT LETTER #7 RESPONSE**

### **Comment Letter #7 – Scott Drummond**

7-1. The commenter questions Caltrans' allocation of resources to the Interchange Project. The Interchange Project is privately funded.

7-2. The commenter suggests that the Interchange Project will change the character of the neighborhoods surrounding the Rancheria. Socioeconomic and community impacts are beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, having been litigated and decided in favor of Caltrans by both the trial court and the Court of Appeal. Accordingly, they are beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. Further, similar comments were made on the 2002 Draft EIR and the 2002 Final EIR provided detailed responses to those comments. 2002 Final EIR at Responses 40-7, 42-18, 42-23, 42-24, 51-2, 51-3, 51-11, 51-12.

7-3. The commenter questions how Caltrans can control the size of the hotel and casino since it lacks jurisdiction over the Rancheria or the Shingle Springs Tribe. Caltrans agrees that it lacks such jurisdiction and that it cannot control the size of the hotel and casino. For the purposes of evaluating the environmental impacts of the Interchange Project, however, Caltrans used the casino and hotel specifications provided to it by the Tribe. Further, the size of the Interchange Project, at one lane in each direction, is as small as it can possibly be while still providing practical access to the Rancheria.

7-4. This comment questions the value of the Interchange Project to the community. Such issues are beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, having been litigated and decided previously in favor of Caltrans by both the trial court and the Court of Appeal. Accordingly, they are beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. Further, similar comments were made on the 2002 Draft EIR and the 2002 Final EIR provided detailed responses to those comments. 2002 Final EIR at Responses 45-1, 45-2, 45-3, 49-2, 49-3, 49-4, 49-5.

7-5. This comment raises issues regarding socioeconomic impacts and public services impacts. Regarding socioeconomic impacts, please see Response 7-2, above. Regarding public services impacts, such issues are beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, having been litigated and decided previously in favor of Caltrans by both the trial court and the Court of Appeal. Accordingly, they are beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. Further, similar comments were made on the 2002 Draft EIR and the 2002 Final EIR provided detailed responses to those comments. 2002 Final EIR at Responses 23-3 and 49-2.

7-6. This comment again raises issues related to neighborhood character. Please see Response 7-2, above.

7-7. This comment again raises issues related to socioeconomic impacts. Please see Response 7-2, above.